DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 124 32 RC 007 467

AUTHOR	Satterfield, Christina, Comp.
TITLE	State of Tennessee Annual Evaluation Report for Fiscal Year 1971.
INSTITUTION	Tennessee State Dept. of Education, Nashville.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	38p.; Related document is ED053487; PL91-230, ESEA Title I
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Involvement; Curriculum; *Educational Disadvantagement; Federal Aid; Kindergarten Children; *Low Income Groups; *Migrant Education; Needs; *Program Evaluation; *Rural Areas; State Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	*Tennessee

ABSTRACT

Information from 148 local evaluation reports submitted to the Tennessee Department of Education for both regular and summer programs is presented in the Annual Report on Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I programs. This covers the administrative structure, the role of the State Department of Education, the population, needs assessment, program effectiveness, program evaluation, and the effect on the regular school program. Also included are reports on supportive services, nonpublic school involvement, parent and community involvement, and the role of other Federal agencies. In-service activities for the 4,435 teachers and 2,917 aides involved in Title I work are described. Additionally, problems that have occurred in the implementation of Title I activities and recommendations made by the State Department of Education are listed. (PS)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085124

ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA
ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA
ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

RECEIVED
1973
E.R.I.C.

Title I Evaluation 1971

Tennessee State Department of Education • E. C. Stimbert, Commissioner

ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA
ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA
ESEA ESEA ESEA ESEA

007467

ED 085124

STATE OF TENNESSEE

ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
for
FISCAL YEAR 1971

PL 91-230
ESEA TITLE I

Submitted by:

Ervin H. Thomas
Coordinator ESEA Title I

Prepared by:

Christina Satterfield
Supervisor ESEA Title I

INTRODUCTION

This report is a compilation of information from 148 local evaluation reports submitted to the Tennessee Department of Education for the Fiscal Year 1971 and represents data from all of these reports for both regular and summer programs. Each report was read and data accumulated to assess the impact of Title I on local school systems for the amelioration of the problems of educationally deprived children in Tennessee.

School systems wishing to provide Title I Programs for disadvantaged children were--in accordance with State and Federal Guidelines--required to identify attendance areas, assess needs of children in these areas, plan activities to meet these needs, submit applications to the State Department of Education for approval, implement the projects, evaluate results, and maintain fiscal records.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Administrative Structure	1
Role of the State Department of Education	1
Particular Points Stressed by State Department of Education	2
The Population	4
Assessment of Needs	6
Programs	7
Program Effectiveness	9
Other Sources of Evaluation	12
Program Characteristics	14
Effect on Administration of the Regular School Program	16
Effect on Regular School Program	18
Supportive Services	20
Involving Nonpublic Schools	22
Parent and Community Involvement	23
Other Federal Agencies	25
Dissemination	27
In Service	27
Problems	31
Recommendations	32

ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The administrative structure of the ESEA-Title I Staff is designed to provide both consultative and supervisory services to one-hundred and forty-seven local school systems in Tennessee. The central office staff consists of one coordinator, two directors, and six supervisors. One supervisor works with Migrant Education, one works with the Neglected, Delinquent and Handicapped Programs; one supervisor is responsible for evaluation of all ESEA-Title I Projects, another works with financial audit and review, and two supervisors are assigned to program review.

Additional personnel consists of eight field supervisors who are assigned to specific geographic areas in the state. The field supervisors assist local school systems on all matters involving ESEA-Title I Projects, while the central office professionals visit local school systems when their particular talents are needed. All field visits to the local school systems are multi-purpose visits.

ROLE OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Eight regional meetings were held across the state in addition to meetings dealing with a particular phase of Title I (evaluation, in service sessions, etc.). The regional meetings, field visits, and area specific meetings do not include all contacts with the local school systems since telephone calls and visits by the local school systems to the central office are not recorded. If these methods of communication were also included, it would be apparent that close contact with the local school systems is maintained by ESEA - Title I throughout the year.

In the leadership role which the State Department of Education occupies the following concerns are involved in State Department of Education-local school system contacts:

Dissemination of guidelines, instructions, and applications

Consultative services for in service sessions, project operation, and the fiscal operation of the project

Monitoring of projects with appropriate feedback to the local school systems

Assistance with the writing and planning of projects

Review of project applications

Assistance with technical questions involving evaluation procedures

Provision of information regarding educational research, tests, and innovative projects.

Dissemination of information regarding the intent and purposes of Title I

Provision of information regarding the current status and legislation of Title I in the United States

PARTICULAR POINTS STRESSED BY STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

For the past year emphasis has been placed largely on the intent of Title I, comparability, parent involvement, the focus on target area children only, and planning and evaluation. The Tennessee Evaluation Design stressing measureable objectives and the use of evaluation data to form feedback systems was implemented by the State Department of Education. Since the assessment of needs phase of the design was the area of greatest difficulty for the local school systems, major emphasis was placed on providing assistance in the procedures necessary to accomplish the assessment of needs. Because the evaluation design is a systems approach to

the problem, the use of the design provides for improved effectiveness of Title I projects as well as soundness of operation in adhering to Title I guidelines.

Concentration on K through six was also encouraged by the State Department of Education since the use of preventative rather than remedial programs appears to be a better investment in terms of behavior change in the students. The effectiveness of the treatment appears to be far greater from the use of preventative rather than corrective procedures.

Coordination of the Title I projects with the regular school program has been a major concern of the State Department of Education. Stress has been placed on follow up activities for the child to insure the retention of the behavior change that has been brought about through Title I activities.

The ESEA - Title I staff stressed the following points in interaction with the local school systems:

Concentration on a limited number of children, not to exceed the number of identified economically deprived children for that school system

The necessity of documentation in assessing the needs of educationally deprived children

Meeting the most pressing needs first, and not attempt to meet all needs if funds are not adequate to the purpose

Identification of target children to be served by the programs in order to produce the effect desired and prevent the watering down of activities

Emphasis on needs of children rather than justification of programs

Assurance that Title I personnel spends all of their time on Title I activities

Emphasis on the rationale for comparability to assure that Title I programs are supplemental

Designing supportive services to implement the academic program, and include only those children involved in Title I activities

Limiting of materials and equipment to only those necessary to the successful operation of the project

Designing evaluation procedures at the same time as the project in order to prevent after-the-fact procedures

The use of evaluation data in planning the projects to follow

The use of all other sources of funding for projects before Title I funds are used

THE POPULATION

In Tennessee there are 147 local school systems and one state supported high school grades 9 - 12. All of these systems operate Title I projects for the regular school year; however, not all local school systems provide Title I summer programs for their disadvantaged children.

FIGURE 1

TOTAL NUMBER OF TITLE I PROJECTS

No. of LEA's Participating in Title I			Total No. of LEA's in Tennessee	Total No. of Title I Programs
Regular School Term Only	Summer Only	Regular & Summer		
82	0	66	147-local school system 1-state supported	148

In Tennessee, 223,778 public and non-public school children participated in Title I activities in 1971. Of this number 221,933 were public school children out of a total enrollment of 937,471 (K-12). This number amounts to 24% of the total enrollment. Many counties, cities, and special school districts in Tennessee do not have private schools operating within the area. Some of the private schools which are eligible for participation in Title I activities chose not to participate, or in some instances the lack of children from low income families or the lack of an open admissions policy prohibited their eligibility for Title I services. Most nonpublic schools that met Title I qualifications were asked to participate. Many of these schools chose not to participate because of (1) religious reasons or (2) lack of need for Title I activities.

FIGURE 2

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF PUPILS PARTICIPATING

IN TITLE I PROGRAMS

Type of Enrollment	Number	%
Public	221,933	99%
Private	1,845	1%
Total	223,778	100%

A profile of the Title I child in Tennessee would vary in some instances with geographical location. The population of Title I children in Tennessee includes the low income child in mountainous rural East Tennessee, the low socio-economic status black and white child of the metropolitan cities, and the low income black child of the rural West Tennessee lowlands. Nevertheless there are characteristics that these children share. They are undernourished, inadequately clothed, insufficiently stimulated by the environment in which they live, and educationally underachieving.

ASSESSMENT OF NEEDS

In assessing the needs of the Title I participants, the criteria most often used by the local school systems consisted of scores on standardized tests, teacher ratings, teacher opinion, comments from advisory committee meetings, and the general ability of the children to function in the classroom. These factors were used to determine the academic needs of the target area children. Reading was the academic area in which most of the children showed the greatest deficiency. The fact that the child could not perform in other curriculum areas, if he could not read, was additional rationale for establishing reading programs and language arts programs.

Usually the children who enter the first grade lacking in experiences and readiness are the same children who continue to have difficulty in later grades. Therefore kindergartens rank second in frequency of Title I projects. Kindergartens were established as a preventive method of dealing with the problem of the educationally disadvantaged student. It was felt by the local people that the best investment is the young child since the amount of probable improvement in achievement diminishes with the increase in age.

PROGRAMS

Figure 5 lists all Title I programs for Tennessee for fiscal year 1971. There is duplication in the numbers of children since some children participated in more than one activity. Some duplication of the number of teachers and aides is also involved because of their assignment to more than one activity.

FIGURE 3

APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF TITLE I CHILDREN,
TEACHERS, AND AIDES COMPARED TO TOTAL NUMBER FOR THE STATE

Children			Teachers			Aides		
Total	Title I	%	Total	Title I	%	Total	Title I	%
937,471	221,933	24%	35,922	2,208	6%	3,660	2,772	76%

The total grant for Tennessee for fiscal year 1971 was 36,288,395 dollars. Projects approved as of June 30, 1971, amounted to 34,962,250 dollars while the total amount expended or incumbered by August 31, 1971, was 32,269,717 dollars. These figures include programs for both summer and the regular school year. The prerogative of some local school systems to carry funds over to the following year account for part of the difference in these figures.

FIGURE 5

TITLE I PROGRAMS IN RANK ORDER

BY THE NUMBER IN OPERATION DURING FISCAL YEAR 1971

Curriculum Area	Number of Programs			Number of Children			Number of Teachers			Number of Aides		
	Reg.	Summer	Total	Reg.	Summer	Total	Reg.	Summer	Total	Reg.	Summer	Total
Reading	135	51	186	105,805	21,708	127,513	1,688	1,183	2,871	1,636	427	2,063
Kindergarten	119	18	137	10,485	3,522	14,007	419	201	620	481	176	657
Music	41	8	49	36,371	2,512	38,883	107	61	168	65	5	70
Mathematics	25	19	44	12,017	7,166	19,183	177	321	498	188	63	251
Art	28	14	42	30,204	4,342	34,546	156	80	236	34	37	71
Vocational Ed.	21	9	30	4,025	805	4,830	58	54	112	13	16	29
Physical Ed.	17	5	22	49,274	1,068	50,342	58	14	72	120	3	123
Social Studies	11	7	18	2,332	1,484	3,816	16	59	75	41	5	46
Science	10	8	18	11,364	558	11,922	22	42	64	37	6	43
Academic Assist.	5	7	12	2,272	972	3,244	97	89	186	62	28	90
Cultural Enrich.	7	4	11	3,981	986	4,967	41	30	71	14	6	20
Special Ed.	6	1	7	1,619	40	1,659	51	3	54	18	3	21
Recreation	-	7	7	--	2,342	2,342	-	80	80	-	10	10
Tutoring	5	2	7	1,064	46	1,110	4	9	13	20	-	20
Health-Nutrition	5	1	6	4,565	963	5,528	18	12	30	49	-	49
Driver Education	4	1	5	771	80	851	3	4	7	2	-	2
Special Needs	4	-	4	219	-	219	7	-	7	6	-	6
Indiv. Instr.	4	-	4	797	-	797	14	-	14	14	-	14
Guidance-Couns.	3	-	3	417	-	417	-	-	-	2	-	2
Typing	-	3	3	-	73	73	-	4	4	-	-	-
Outdoor Ed.	2	-	2	6,896	-	6,896	2	-	2	-	-	-
Curriculum Enrich	1	-	1	403	-	403	3	-	3	-	-	-
Perceptual Train.	1	-	1	594	-	594	-	-	-	7	-	7
Parents Club	1	-	1	18	-	18	1	-	1	-	-	-
Spanish	1	-	1	600	-	600	1	-	1	-	-	-
Consumer Ed.	1	-	1	74	-	74	1	-	1	1	-	1
Library-Research	1	-	1	600	-	600	2	-	2	3	-	3
Programmed Instr.	1	-	1	730	-	730	8	-	8	4	-	4
Volunteer Program	-	1	1	-	341	341	-	3	3	-	-	-
Summer Camp (EMR)	-	1	1	-	26	26	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	459	167	626	287,497	49,034	336,531	2,954	2,249	5,203	2,817	785	3,602

FIGURE 4

ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL

No. of Participants	Amount of Expenditure	Average Per Pupil Expenditure
223,778	$32,269,717	$144.20

PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The local school system submitted the performance objectives that had been designed to evaluate Title I activities. The measurement named in these objectives varied with the school systems. This means that collection of group data became very difficult since a wide variety of standardized tests were used. In addition to this factor, teacher tests, frequency counts, and observations were in some cases employed to measure results. The situation was further complicated by the fact that some systems gave different tests to selected grades. In addition to these factors a few systems gave tests only one time so that no pre and posttest data was available. Also, in some instances the same test was not given for the pre and posttest, again resulting in no comparison.

In figure 6 the four most often used test to measure reading achievement are listed with the average amount of increase for each grade tested when the scores reported by each local school systems were

FIGURE 6

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF INCREASE BY
TESTS AND GRADES

Test / Grade	Stanford Achv.		Metropolitan Achv.		California Achv.		Gates-MacGinitie	
	No. of LEA's Reporting	Average Increase	No. of LEA's Reporting	Average Increase	No. of LEA's Reporting	Average Increase	No. of LEA's Reporting	Average Increase
2	26	.6	18	.7	7	.9	12	.8
3	34	.7	17	.6	11	.9	14	.5
4	35	.8	16	.7	9	.8	12	.6
5	35	.9	27	.7	9	.9	13	.4
6	30	.8	15	.5	7	.8	13	.7
7	24	.8	9	.8	3	1.1	8	.6
8	20	.9	17	.2	5	1.1	5	1.1
9	6	.5	3	.6	5	.8	6	1.0
10	1	.1	-	-	5	.9	-	-
11	2	.6	-	-	3	.7	-	-
12	2	.7	-	-	4	.4	-	-
Avg. for all Grades		.7		.6		.8		.7

averaged for each grade. In this exhibit the local school systems are treated as subjects, and each grade is averaged across subjects.

One must be extremely careful in generalizing from these increases since the sample is not random for the reasons already mentioned. Also it is entirely possible that the local school systems who reported no scores had the smallest amount of gain. Nevertheless where twenty-five or thirty local school systems have reported some indication regarding the progress made is possible. The first grade does not appear on the list, since usually first graders are not tested, pre and post, using standardized achievement tests, rather, teacher-made tests and observations are used, and it is impossible to draw conclusions from all of those individual tests.

The achievement of kindergarten children was measured largely by teacher observation. A variety of tests were given in the instances in which standardized tests were used. Thus no data can be compiled within this situation that would generalize to the entire kindergarten population. Nevertheless there are indicators regarding the success of the kindergarten programs. Twelve systems gave the Metropolitan Readiness test to the kindergarten children and reported scores in the same manner, making it possible to average the scores. This means that 2,669 children were tested resulting in an average score equivalent to level C. Five local school systems reported results of the Metropolitan Readiness test in levels. In this sample, 358 children scored level C on the test which indicates a score in the average range using national norms.

By subjective evaluation most school systems felt that progress was being made. In reviewing the objectives set by each system, it was impossible to classify them regarding results because in some instances the objectives were reached with a smaller number of children, in other cases more children showed more change than was expected but a lower level than was anticipated. These divergent forces make it impossible to establish a clear picture of whether or not objectives were met. Test scores and reports from the local school systems then became the only alternative. These instruments, however, were used to measure objectives.

OTHER SOURCES OF EVALUATION

Several other sources of information were used in evaluating Title I projects. Data from monitoring supplied data for process evaluation. Staff evaluation committees, questionnaires, feedback from those persons involved in Title I activities were all used to gain information for program evaluation. By far the source most often used was teachers ratings. A complete list appears in Figure 7. Only three systems reported that no other sources of evaluation were used.

Teachers made recommendations regarding project activities which fall generally into the following categories:

An improved training program for teachers

Improved methods of diagnosing student problems

Better liaison with the regular classroom

Breakfast programs

FIGURE 7

OTHER SOURCES OF EVALUATION

Sources	Number of LEA's Using the Source
Teacher Ratings	123
Parent Observations	70
Principal's Ratings	43
Student Comment	34
Supervisor's Evaluation	21
Cumulative and Anecdotal	19
Response from Community and Civic Groups	19
Staff Meeting Evaluation	18
Feed Back from the Advisory Committee	12
Consultants	13
Attendance Records	11
Responses from Guidance Personnel	8
Aides Evaluation	7
Reports from Social Workers	6
Tests Accompanying Basal Texts	5
Superintendent's Evaluation	3
Interest Inventories	3
Children Back to Their Regular Classroom	2
Group Interaction	1
Oral Reading	1
Personality Profiles	1
Lists of Books Read	1

Programs assisting parents in becoming a positive force in the education of their children

More involvement of teachers in planning programs and assessing needs.

PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

The local school systems were asked to name the characteristics common to the most effective activities. The local school systems most often named additional materials as the largest contributing factor to their programs. In conjunction with this category is that of additional equipment. Reading labs were provided in some cases while other instances teachers used a wide varities of materials to teach reading.

Emphasis on the individual child was next in importance with individualized instruction and small group teaching ranking in second place. Several other categories are associated with these two emphasizing a child-centered approach. For example, closely aligned with these factors is the use of competent personnel with an understanding of the disadvantaged child. Additional personnel and the involvement of teachers and aides were also named.

Several of the categories are associated with the idea of close ties between home and school and the involvement of parents in the planning and operation of the Title I activities. A complete list of the characteristics named by the local school systems is included on the following page.

FIGURE 8

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MOST SUCCESSFUL PROJECTS

Characteristics	Number of Times Named by the LEA's
Use of Additional Materials	40
Small Group Teaching	30
Individualized Instruction	30
Competant Personnel	25
Type of Equipment	22
Aides	21
Effective Supervision	17
Parental Involvement	12
Use of Diagnostic Techniques	11
Correlation with Classroom Activities	11
Additional Teachers	10
Additional Activities (Field Trips, Etc.)	6
Innovative Teaching Methods	6
Activities Designed to Give the Child Success	5
Flexibility in the Program	4
Home-School Coordination	4
Child Centered Approaches	4
Use of Consultants	3
Child Choosing His Activities	3
Assistance From a Library Program	2
Close Monitoring	1
Tutoring	1
Involving Teacher and Aid in Planning	1
More Planning Time	1
Lack of Grades	1

EFFECT ON ADMINISTRATION OF THE REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Local school systems were asked what effect Title I had on the administration of the regular school program. Of the 147 local school systems in Tennessee 20 reported that Title I had no effect on the administration of the regular school program. More as well as better trained personnel was the factor most often named by the local school system as effecting the administration of the minimum foundation program. In conjunction with the increase in personnel is the emphasis on more duties and responsibilities for the administrators.

New ideas and new curriculum concepts were influential in the administration of school programs. More emphasis on evaluation had a definite effect on programs. For example, one local school system reported that a questionnaire developed for Title I evaluation led to the construction of an instrument used by classroom teachers to evaluate elementary supervisors. This was the first formal evaluation of its kind used in the system.

Another local school system reported that "a systematic approach to program planning and operation, including the use of performance objectives and a systems management approach", begun for Title I programs, is proving effective on a wider scope. "Through this process a more unified effort on the part of the school system is being made to achieve specifically identified objectives. The instructional staff across the system is actively involved in examining how the activities which are incorporated into the instructional program relate to, or promote the realization of specific objectives."

FIGURE 9

EFFECTS OF TITLE I ON THE

ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOOL PROGRAMS

Effects	Number of Times Named by LEA's
More Personnel	32
More Duties for Administrators	14
New Ideas	14
More Emphasis on Evaluation	12
New Curriculum Concepts	11
Joint Planning With Title I and Regular Staff	9
Changes in Schedules	7
More Demands on Administration	7
More Interest in the Individual	5
More Planning	5
Improved Dissemination	4
More Restraints (Comparability)	3
More Time Required of Administrators	3
Better Awareness of Needs	3
Evaluation of Materials	3
Changes More Easily Accepted	3
More Interest in Pupil-Teacher Ratio	2
More Delegation of Authority	1
New Interest in Dropouts	1
Exploration of Community Resources	1
More Local Money Spent on Education	1
Desire to Improve Quality of Programs	1
Relationship of Cost to Objectives	1
More Organization	1

Planning in varying forms was emphasized by 14 of the local systems, and most of the remaining categories involved new approaches to problems or awareness of different methods of administration. See Figure 9 for a complet list of categories named by the local systems as effecting administration.

EFFECT ON REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM

Only seven school systems responded that Title I had no effect on the regular school program. A broader curriculum was the effect most often seen by local school systems as a result of Title I programs, and individualized instruction ranked second in effects on the regular program. Most of the categories named had resulted in change in a positive direction for the minimum foundation program. One factor underlying many of the effects named is the additional time provided for teachers which has led to a more enriched environment in the classroom.

One system comments briefly in the following manner:

> "Through conferences and observation, classroom teachers have become aware of and interested in reading materials other than basal readers. Some are now using a wider variety of interesting materials. Aides have made possible much more intensive instruction in the classroom. Conferences with reading teachers have helped the classroom teachers to learn the specific areas of weakness in the disadvantaged child's education and how to determine probable expectancy level,

FIGURE 10

EFFECTS ON REGULAR SCHOOL PROGRAM NAMED BY LEA'S

Effect Categories	Number of Times Named by LEA's
Broader Curriculum	47
Individualized Instruction	34
Better Teaching Methods	25
More Need Oriented	17
Better Use of Teacher's Time by Use of Aides	17
Better Evaluation Techniques	14
More and Better Planning	13
More Emphasis On Language Arts and Reading	13
More Understanding and Flexibility	12
Better Programs	12
More Changes in Schedules	10
More Innovative Practices	8
More Nongraded Classes	7
More Communication Between Faculty	7
Better Testing Methods	6
Better Attendance	6
More Grouping	6
More Team Teaching	5
Use of Small Group Instruction	5
Kindergartens Established	4
More In Service	4
Change in Reports to Parents	2
More Open Schools	1
Less Responsibility for Teachers in Regular Programs	1
Fewer Retentions	1

resulting in more reasonable pressure on the child. This knowledge has also been generalized to include other children. Through the counselors' efforts to help the disadvantaged child, classroom teachers have learned about and used successfully grade contracting and behavioral modification techniques."

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Supportive services selected to aid in the implementation of Title I projects were based on observations of teachers and administrators. Food largely consisted of snacks and breakfast with some lunches involved. The category receiving the most attention from the local school systems was the medical-dental area. Since these areas contribute to the general well being of the child, the local school systems reasoned that a physical disability could impede the child's ability to concentrate and thus to study and pay attention in class. Also, a physical disability could prevent the child's functioning; for example, poor eye sight could prevent his reading.

Attendance and social work are closely aligned, and possibly should not be separated. These categories include programs to keep target children in school, to cut down on absenteeism, to promote family interest in school programs, to provide information to school personnel regarding the child's environment.

FIGURE 11

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES BY TYPE,
NUMBER OF STAFF, AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN

Type of Service	No. of Children			No. of Staff		
	Regular	Summer	Total	Regular	Summer	Total
Food	57,352	4,241	61,593	97	41	138
Clothes	15,102	260	15,362	58	3	61
Medical-Dental	57,106	6,977	64,083	172	23	195
Social Work	35,337	1,097	36,434	90	4	94
Library & Materials	29,580	2,573	32,153	121	13	134
Psychological Services	13,087	-	13,087	23	-	23
Guidance	34,554	4,838	39,392	118	54	172
Transportation	8,759	4,294	13,053	45	37	82
Attendance	4,460	1,165	5,625	6	2	8
Maintenance & Repair	1,778	-	1,778	2	-	2
Total	257,115	25,445	282,560	732	177	909

Likewise psychological services and guidance are closely related. These two supportive services provide tests and results, counseling services, initiates plans for the child's adjustment to school, aides in identification of the potential drop out, and provides information to school personnel regarding the child. There is an overlap of goals for these various categories, and also a difference among the local school systems regarding the duties of the personnel involved in these two supportive services.

Transportation category listed on the accompanying chart involves the transporting of Title I children to kindergarten, field trips, enriching activities, and other activities necessary to the implementation of the Title I programs. Clothes are purchased for those children who cannot attend school because of lack of clothing. The number in the clothing category on Figure 11 in many instances involves the purchase of items such as shoes, since many articles of clothing are donated by the community, thus leaving only nonreuseable items, i.e. shoes, to be bought from Title I funds.

INVOLVING NONPUBLIC SCHOOLS

Nine local school systems reported activities involving nonpublic school children. Seven of these local school systems made materials, equipment, and film strips available to the nonpublic schools. Psychological and guidance services and testing services were provided by three school systems. Remedial sessions and tutoring were initiated in two instances. A coordinator of audio visual aides worked with an institution to enrich their instructional program. Aides provided assistance in one case and health services were supplied for one nonpublic school.

One system enrolled two children from an orphanage in the kindergarten program while one school system made all their Title I services available to children from an institution for neglected children.

PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

All local school systems reported some involvement of parents and community in Title I activities. All Title I projects are required to have an advisory committee the membership composed of one over half parents of children in a target area. However, the state educational agency feels parents should be involved in other activities also. The involvement of parents as discussed here is in addition to the advisory committees.

Title I mothers were employed as aides in Title I projects more often than any other kind of activity involved parents. Parents accompanied children on field trips, took part in school activities and acted as volunteers for various school activities. Parent conferences, letters to parents, home visits and classroom visits were used to keep parents informed regarding school programs. Parent Teacher Association meetings were used to inform parents regarding Title I in general and ongoing programs in particular.

Community groups aided Title I programs through donations of clothing and money, glasses, books, and playing equipment. School persons involved in Title I activities also appeared before civic and community groups in order to inform them regarding Title I projects. Community members also visited the schools in order to promote the children's awareness of their environment.

FIGURE 12

TYPES AND NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES

INVOLVING PARENTS AND COMMUNITY

Activities	Number of LEA's Reporting
Parents as Aides in the School	52
Parents Accompanying Children on Field Trips	49
Parents as Aides or Observers in Activities	46
Parent-Teacher Conferences	44
Parents as Volunteers to Assist in Activities	42
Use of PTA to Involve Parents	37
Classroom Visits by Parents	35
Home Visits by School Personnel	30
Open House at the School	21
Clothing and Donations by Community Groups	15
Civic Groups Aiding in School Activities	14
Involving Community in Educational Meetings	9
Transportation Supplied by Parents and Community	9
Letters to Parents	5
Title I Mothers Employed (Not as Aides)	2
Educational Programs Involving Parents and Community	2
Activities in Homes Sponsored by School Personnel	1

People from the community were also invited to meetings of educators in order to increase their understanding of requirements and operation of Title I programs. See Figure 12 for a complete list of activities involving parents and community.

OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES

The State Department of Education urged local agencies to exhaust all possible resources to meet needs before using Title I funds in order to prevent duplication of effort and assure the most expedient use of available money. Information regarding other federal programs that offer services is given to the local school systems by the State Department of Education to prevent this duplication.

The federally funded free lunch program is used by all local school systems in the state. This means that Title I money need only be spent for breakfast, snacks, and meals for Title I kindergarten children. The Title I kindergartens also cooperate with the headstart programs in Tennessee, and the major area of cooperation in this instance is the use of materials, equipment, facilities, and personnel.

The Careers Opportunity Program (C.O.P.) provided on-the-job work experience and college training for Title I education aides. C.O.P. has a well defined program for both employment and college training leading toward a degree in teaching. Title I cooperated with this program in two school systems, and aides were given time from their jobs to attend classes.

Community Action Agencies were involved in Title I programs in recruiting kindergarten children for Title I kindergartens and in coordinating related activities in instruction, transportation, food services, and time schedules to mesh Title I programs with Headstart programs. Other federal programs obviously used to implement Title I activities are NDEA, other ESEA programs, EPDA and EHA.

Local health and welfare agencies were helpful in the planning and operation of Title I programs. This cooperation can best be illustrated by citing an excerpt from one of the local evaluation reports:

> "The director of the program and the social worker cooperate in every way possible with the welfare department in coordinating services for these children. This cooperation has resulted in finding satisfactory ways of meeting the needs of these children and has also prevented the overlapping of services.
>
> The Health Department continues to work in full cooperation with the project. It has provided vaccinations, inoculations, vitamins, and iron where called for, and many other services for children. This year, in full cooperation with the three local medical doctors and Title I, the Health Department administered blood sugar tests to approximately 2100 children in the school system trying to screen possible cases of diabetes in the earliest stages."

DISSEMINATION

Listed below in rank order are the methods used in disseminating information regarding Title I and the frequency with which each occurred.

Newspapers 98

Faculty and In Service Meetings 73

Community and Staff Contacts 58

Radio Programs 56

Parent Conferences 53

Newsletters and Bulletins 43

PTA Meetings 41

Visits by Community Members to School 28

Information Regarding the Project Relayed to Teacher or Schools 17

Tapes, Movies, etc. 11

Television 6

Teacher's Meetings 3

School Assemblies 2

IN SERVICE

In-Service activities for Title I in Tennessee were varied regarding type and content. Workshops for discussion and planning were one of the most popular kinds of in-service. These sessions were often coupled with lectures. Many of the 4,435 teachers and 2,917 aides involved in the In-Service attended workshops, classes, or lecture series on

college campuses. Consultants consisted of state department personnel, college faculty members and test company representatives. In all, 1,204 consultants assisted in conducting Title I in service activities.

Local school systems used in-service days to orient teachers and aides regarding their tasks for the approaching school year. Workshops for the purpose of teaching teachers how to evaluate programs were initiated by many systems. These sessions involved the writing of behavioral objectives, compilation of data, and orientation regarding tests. Other workshops involved the evaluation of the project for the previous year; that is, teachers were asked to assist in the interpretation of data, make determinations as to the success of the program, and assess the degree to which objectives were met.

Many techniques were used in the in-service activities. Role playing, simulation, and group discussion are examples of the those techniques used for training purposes.

Teachers during in-service constructed materials and curriculum guides for use in the following year, and evaluation of materials and textbooks was a part of the activity in some cases. In-service educational activities were designed in some instances to emphasize the need for faculty members under the minimum foundation program to become more involved with personnel who work directly with Title I children in order to become more aware of the problems caused by educational and cultural deprevation.

Not all school systems supplied in-service for Title I personnel over and above the ten days required by the state. Often Title I teachers are included in the ten days only. On the other hand, several systems structured summer sessions to provide educational experiences for the Title I personnel. The most used method, however, consisted of a period of time allotted before the beginning of school for orientation and planning and days set aside during the school year for educational activities. Some systems then include a few days at the end of the school year to provide time for evaluation of the program.

One of the most significant problems regarding in-service is the lack of evaluation regarding the activities. Some local school systems did evaluate the in-service sessions by asking teachers and aides to respond to a questionnaire. Others asked consultants to evaluate the behavioral changes that may have taken place regarding the participants. School administrators assessed that which had been accomplished in other instances. Self evaluation on the teachers part was the method used in other cases. The problem in many cases was the subjectivity of the evaluation. Criteria was not specified before the activities began, thus an objective evaluation of the in-service session became difficult and even impossible in some instances.

Teachers, aides, administrators and consultants made suggestions regarding future in-service activities; some of these are listed below:

Area Specific Training Should be the Primary Focus.

Activities for Aides Should Not Involve Extremely Technical Language.

More Skills in Problem Solving are Needed.

More Information Regarding Evaluation Should be Included.

Teachers Should be Supplied Feedback Information Regarding Teacher Techniques.

Careful Monitoring Should be Done for Project Component.

More Individual Instruction is Essential.

The following is an excerpt from a local evaluation report in which adequate evaluation of in service was accomplished:

"The practice of assigning a specific task or concept to be incorporated by the individual teacher or aide for a given period followed by an evaluation of that activity has provided constructive feed-back and often effectively modified the behavior or performance pattern of the instructor."

FIGURE 13

IN SERVICE FOR REGULAR

AND SUMMER PROGRAMS

Type of Program	Days	Consultants	Teacher*	Aides*
Regular	1,718	1,122	2,970	2,491
Summer	155	82	1,465	426
Total	1,873	1,204	4,435	2,917

*Some duplication exists in these categories since teachers and aides employed in the summer program are often the same people employed in the regular program.

PROBLEMS

The local school systems were asked to list problems that had occurred in the implementation of Title I activities. The following is a list of these problems in rank order:

Lack of understanding regarding Title I on the part of parents and school personnel

Funding after school has begun

Lack of sufficient space for activities

Lack of trained personnel

Lack of parent participation

Focusing programs on Title I children only

Lack of funds

Insufficient coordination with the minimum foundation program

Unclear or late guidelines

Lack of planning time

Inadequate monitoring system

Not enough staff

Too many participants in the program

Not enough information on the children

Misuse of teacher aides

Attempting to meet too many needs

Performance objectives not specific enough

Lack of evaluation data

Too many regulations

Requirement to meet comparability too restricting

Program or staff not child centered

Lack of materials and equipment

Need for curriculum revisions

Lack of transportation

Problems of human relations

Inadequate and unrelated in service

Need for a local Title I director

Bookkeeping Problems

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions were made by the State Department of Education:

Adequate evaluation of all programs at all levels of decision-making

Use of specific data in assessing needs

More emphasis on assessing needs and less emphasis on justification of programs

Objective evaluation of in service activities

Involvement of teachers in assessing needs and planning

More systematized monitoring

Use of IQ scores as a predictor not as a means of grouping

A narrowing of the scope of some programs

Specified criteria for the selection of program participants

Determination of factors common to successful programs

Active participation of advisory committees in assessing needs and planning programs

The local school systems recommended:

More thorough use of the data gathered

Better dissemination of information to the community

Earlier dissemination of more lucid guidelines

Earlier funding

Inclusion of questions for the evaluation report in the guidelines

More coordination between Title I and the regular school program

Means of promoting better understanding of Title I by community and regular school personnel

More space for Title I programs in some schools

Better use of aides

Better trained personnel in some Title I programs

Changes in schedules to adapt to Title I programs

Better in-service activities

More emphasis on the lower grades

More specific performance objectives

Additional personnel

Use of small groups for teaching

New teaching methods

Less paper work

More instructional materials

More assistance in evaluating programs

Evaluation of materials and equipment

Better monitoring

Fewer restrictions in guidelines

More planning time

Expanded curriculum

Better coordination at state department level

Changes in fiscal procedure

More meetings with state department personnel

Change in focus of some programs

More information regarding similar programs

Later date for submission of evaluation report

More child-centered programs

Involvement of teachers in assessing needs and planning

A narrowing of the scope of some programs

More participation of community and advisory committee

The above suggestions have been reviewed by the State Department of Education and some plans have been initiated to ameliorate the problems. Obviously, time is required to bring about complete solutions to all the problems listed here.